

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 Maria Smith,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 Henry's Holdings, LLC,

15 Defendant.  
16

No. 2:21-cv-01030-KJM-DB

ORDER

17 The motion to strike portions of the defendant's reply is **denied**. *See* ECF No. 24. The  
18 arguments in question appropriately respond to the plaintiff's opposition. *See, e.g., Bruce v.*  
19 *Woodford*, No. 07-00269, 2012 WL 1424166, at \*5 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2012) ("The purpose of a  
20 reply is to respond to Plaintiff's opposition. . . . [T]he Court will not strike Defendants' arguments  
21 simply because they were not raised in their motion to dismiss."). This order resolves  
22 ECF No. 24.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED: November 29, 2021.  
25

  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE